

THE RISE OF MAGA COMMUNISM

Something has been awakened. And it's only the beginning.



Infrared
Sep 18

105



#MAGACommunism is taking the internet by storm, and it isn't going anywhere. Everyone bearing witness to this phenomena appears puzzled. How can MAGA and COMMUNISM be united? For one is *clearly far-right*, and the other *far-left*.

Thanks for reading Infrared - Essays! Subscribe for free to receive new posts and support my work.

Type your email...

Subscribe

Perhaps it's like the *syncretic*, third position politics of fascism, like National Bolshevism? That, of course, assumes the proper significance of a *political spectrum*.

All political analysts, ideologists, thinkers, and 'political content creators' since the incipient populist era of the 2010s have hitherto used, as a heuristic tool to navigate Euro-American politics - some kind of 'political spectrum.'

The Political Spectrum

All political strategy begins, as an almost axiomatic premise, with an understanding of 'right-wing' and 'left-wing' forces. Thus, one often gets views as the following:

- *Should we vote for Biden? It depends, can we push him left? He is more to the left than Trump...*
- *Voters in America didn't like Bernie, because he was too far to the left, and Americans are currently very right wing.*
- *How can Nazism come from the Democrats? The Democrats are not as right wing as the Republicans, and Nazism is far right.*

Of course, this neglects to explain how supposedly 'right wing' forces appear to outflank leftists all the time, assuming positions, *successfully at that*, that appear to be associated with the extreme-left, like the *unconditional anti-interventionism* espoused by figures like Ron Paul, or the discourse against free market neoliberalism associated with the nascent 2016 Trump campaign.

The contrary is also true. If Breitbart were to release an article expressing a favorable view of eugenics, it would be derided as a form of far-right Nazism. But if MSNBC were to release that same piece, attempting to rehabilitate it from the perspective of climate change, it would pass under the radar of 'leftists' without question. Such unthinkable scenarios happen all the time. The Western Left *routinely* defends arming Ukrainian Neo-Nazis (i.e. as in, *some don't even deny they are Nazis*, but defend arming them anyway) with high-grade military equipment, as the lesser of two evils in the face of Russia.

Yet it still remains an article of faith that the *force* animating, driving, and defining politics - is derived from some continuum, pendulum, or tug-of-war represented in the form of the *political spectrum*. For most liberals - in whom, after all, the political spectrum as a heuristic device *has its origins* (i.e. basing itself in formalistic idealism) Nazism is the primary metaphysical force.

It's actually similar to Star Wars for them, and *the force* has the same meaning. Nazism is a primal, vital 'dark side' whose temptations must be resisted through the politics of 'balance.' Political passions must be reigned in, and ideological belief must be curtailed with a healthy dose of nihilist realism, lest the 'dark side' takes over - or in the words of Jabba the Vaush, the camps come back.

Surprisingly no one has pointed out this funny irony. For liberals and leftists, *only Nazism is real*. Politics, left to its own devices, flows and bends in the direction of Nazism. The political spectrum, for them, is defined by gradations of *resistance* toward this fatal, primal, and vital conclusion. If we suspend the liberal-democratic institutions, and the consciousness corresponding to them (political correctness, formalism, moralism, etc.), we fall into the 'Nazbol vortex,' sucked in by the gravitational force of Nazism.

The ascription of notions like 'force' to politics, implies clearly an implicit, unconscious understanding of a *political metaphysics*. Hobbes, proceeding with his Baconian metaphysical materialism, geometrically contrives the substance of political power in the opposing and contrary interests of atoms (that is, individuals) suspended in the chaos of their repulsion in the war of all against all, which concludes in a sovereign disposed of an absolute monopoly on violence. However, Hobbes was a political metaphysician of (or anticipating) the modern era, for which the concept of politics was

defined in terms of atoms, monads, and states (i.e. in both the physics and political sense) - the social contract between *individual citizens* and some *institution* representing their collective sovereignty.

Just as for today's liberal elites, *only Nazism is real* - for Hobbes, *only criminality (self-interested antisociality) is real*.

In the era of the *breakdown* of Western modernity (and liberal democracy), culminating in the collapse of the Bretton Woods system, the oil embargo, and the 1979 Iranian Revolution - political metaphysicians like (((Karl Popper))) (mentor of (((George Soros)))) viewed not the sovereign as the ends of politics, but institutionalized and conscientious *civil society: The open society*. The sovereign is not the *culmination* of the metaphysical forces driving politics, but is also *driven by them*, capable of producing horrible outcomes like Nazism or Communism. For Hobbes, individuals are irrational, self-interested, and driven by wild metaphysical forces. They become truly rational only by means of the sovereign. But for (((Karl Popper))), sovereigns are suspended by the same forces - thus institutional civil society must be vigilant, or else the politically impassioned *masses* will create an updated version of Hobbesian chaos - *Nazism*.

This has been the basic ideological justification and legitimization for US imperialism since then. America isn't the world police to police *individuals*. It polices *states*. It makes sure these sovereigns won't become *Fascists*. The Soviet Union was Fascist. Iraq was Fascist. North Korea is Fascist. Iran is Fascist. Russia is Fascist. Cuba is Fascist. Venezuela is Fascist. The word Fascism today, means *malign sovereignty*: Sovereignty that is misaligned, unaligned, or even nonaligned with the American unipolar global system. The malign individual is an outlaw, a *criminal*. The malign sovereign is a *Fascist*, because their sovereignty used in an *illegitimate* way. Sovereignty is really a funny word today. Its reality contradicts its technical meaning. The sovereign is not the supreme power. It is *subordinated* to the *open society*, or *globality*.

The historical basis for using this word (Fascist), lay in the circumstances of the postwar period. The Second World War was *the war to end all wars*. As a consequence of it, the architects of the Bretton Woods system, the UN, NATO, etc. believed in a new world order of lasting peace, attempting to ensure that nothing could ever disrupt the stability of the international politico-economic system (i.e. the British financial empire) ever

again. Nazism, of course, is the repressed founding sin of this globalism. *Nazism* was the chaos out of which this system founded its *order* upon. Nazism was the final loose-end that had to be cut before the thousand-year-reich could *really* be established. And yet their victory came to haunt them. And so *all those* who came to resist this global system would be declared *Nazis*, because they reminded liberals that they didn't cut all their loose ends. They didn't *defeat* Nazism, *they inherited it*. They *projected* this fact onto others, because others reminded them of this.

Revolutionaries of the past were called criminals. And since the state made no use in distinguishing criminal thugs from revolutionaries, they resorted to criminal means to fight revolutionaries. Today, political dissidents are called Fascists. And since the globalists make no use in distinguishing political resistance from Fascists they, in all their hypocrisy, routinely employ Fascist neo-nazi thugs and employ Fascist means to squash the enemies of globalism. The whole history of the Cold War attests to this. Even *our* political enemies online befriend and try to recruit neo-nazis against us. The situation in Ukraine speaks for itself. Nazism is the *dirty secret* of the globalists. They call everyone Nazis, because this is what they themselves are, deep down. The fact that people are even willing to *resist them* reminds them of this fact.

Malign sovereigns *remind them* of the the founding sin of American unipolarity. The Soviet Union's withdrawal from the Bretton Woods agreement negotiations is itself what created the Cold War. For all the anti-communist propaganda (which is mostly derived from a reactionary quasi-populism from bellow) progressives and liberals, deep down *really* considered the Soviets and their allies as 'red fascists.' In the same way that criminals remind sovereigns of the state's own *founding crime*, malign sovereigns remind globalist liberals of their own *founding Nazism*. The *metaphysical primacy* of Nazism lies in the *artificiality* of globalist liberalism, progressive politics, down to the plainly virtue signaling of wokeness.

Thus not only North Korea, but even Dave Chapelle is a Nazi. His lack of regard for the etiquette of the open society means he has *given in* to the dark side: he has suspended his institutional conscience, and is giving way to the metaphysical force of Fascism. He may be an individual, but his individuality is *politicized* as the atom of a potential *malign sovereignty* (perhaps, the MAGA movement). And such politics are *polarized* ("MAGA is actually a tool of Russian Fascism"). The ultimate conclusion of telling transphobic

jokes, is *chaos*. And *chaos* whirls in the shape of a swastika. *Order* is left-wing, *chaos* is right-wing, because *order* is *progressive globalism*, and *chaos* is *Nazism*. Everything political has turned into its contrary: Great intentionality, artificiality, design, etc. is necessary to maintain *openness* - whereas people, left to their own devices, will become *closed*. Freedom is slavery. Slavery is freedom.

Herein lies the political spectrum, which is more like a *theory of political gravity*. It is Hobbesian liberalism in the age of post-modernity. Such a 'theory' is really a heuristic device of pure paranoia and impotence. It's the copium of a sinking ship, for which water, not the ship itself, is to blame for it sinking. Everything is *Nazi* that proves the inadequacy, failure, and untenability of globalist liberalism; since Nazism was its sanction, justification, and 'casus belli.' The more extreme left, the more one believes in the need for more *control* over this wild force. The more chaotic, the more far right (and those in power regularly employ this 'chaos' to maintain control! *Just think at how much control Jan 6th gave them*).

In the end the political spectrum, for all intensive purposes, is one dimensional. Many attempts have been made to make better and more accurate model of political difference. Yet all of these fail, and are inevitably doomed to failure for the same reasons that the original was, because *they share the same metaphysical premises*. In attempting to devise an impartial representation of political antagonism, ones representation is doomed to itself becoming partial to it. *What political spectrum is the political spectrum itself on?* An inherently absurd and paradoxical question.

A political spectrum is a spatial continuity, whereas political antagonism implies an abrupt and acute *discontinuity*, both in form and content, affecting - twisting, bending and altering even its own *representation*. The first step in being able to understand the *true* forces defining politics is to understand that politics, that is *modern politics*, is its own *force*. The establishment of universal modern statehood, culminating in liberal globalism, is a force of its own kind, a force which corresponds to the history of the bourgeoisie as a class. This force neither bases itself in any particular agential (rational, moral, etc.) intention (like the pursuit of power), nor any primal compulsion (like the 'nazbol vortex', or Hobbesian wild instincts).

Such a force is rather an *immanent contradiction*. An immanent contradiction is an

antagonism, a paradox, a contradiction, etc. not between two discrete things, or two discrete elements, but a type of *pure difference itself*. The story of *modernity* is the story of *pure difference*, and the paradoxical attempts by which it is given form thereof, from German idealist philosophy, French revolutionary politics to English industrial capitalism. Kant's transcendental aesthetic, or the *a priori* pure forms of intuition are divided into space and time *because* the singular object they have in common is *pure discontinuity, difference, or contradiction*. *Capital* has as its object and its basis *pure discontinuity*, or the *alienation* between the worker and his means of production. Finally, modern politics has as its object *pure discontinuity* - between *revolutionary change* and *order*.

Pure difference asserts itself within modern politics in the division between *universal statehood* and *civil society*. Universal statehood, in turn, is the universal form, and *abstracted essence* of the people, which is itself founded upon difference - between *man in general* and *man in particular*, between *abstract right in general* and *real activity in particular*. This abstraction is contrived, not arbitrarily, but based on the *absolute certainty* of the political will which admits no distinction beyond the bounds of its *form*. Just as demons provoked Descartes to find certain refuge only in his thought, the malign sovereigns of the English Civil War provoked the English to find refuge in *pure parliamentary form* (and later, the French in the Republic).

Hence the retards of woke political theory, who critique bourgeois formalism and universalism on account of neglecting differences completely miss the point. "We the people? Are you sure? *What about fat trans indigenous woman?*" *We the people*, and the *universal statehood* implicit in it, is a *purported intention* - a *conceit*. It does not claim to actually know or represent every individual person, it is the *purport* of a state which seeks to *act as a universal people* - and thus, an inherently *abstracted form* of the people, the people *in the institutional purport* of their sovereignty, i.e. if a state will *act as the people* it can only do so as a *pure form* which knows no distinction in content (i.e. between persons).

Thus it does not simply imply a lack of sensitivity to the differences among the people, it implies a fundamental difference, or discontinuity between the people *as a substantive, particular unity* - and the people as an *abstracted, formal one*. The universal or bourgeois state knows no distinctions among the people. But it also knows no distinction between

itself and *its* own, actual reality. And here lies the basic germ which eventually culminates in modern class distinction, between the purport of the universal form of the people, and the reality of its universal content. The proletariat is not like a 'fat trans disabled indigenous woman.' It is not something *excluded* from the universal state, it *is* the universal state in its own *actual*, rather than *conceited* reality - i.e. the meat-grinder of *universal exchange value* - the confrontation between universal form of exchange and *its own* antecedent premises in labor.

However, before class distinction, it is necessary to understand the more fundamental *metaphysical* difference that gives rise to modern *political* difference. Modern political difference, while related, *predates* the modern class struggle. The modern political discontinuity has its origins in the heartbreak of malign, or illegitimate sovereignty. This is first sovereignty illegitimate on its own terms, as in the tumultuous history of the English Civil War, where the sovereign cannot prove itself even by the terms of its own sanction (religion, inheritance, etc.), producing the devastating heartbreak for which everything once thought Good is unreal, illegitimate, false, etc. And then illegitimate in the terms of modern political theories which form in response to said heartbreak (i.e. Hobbes, Rousseau, Locke, etc.).

What remains is a *pure discontinuity* devoid of any tangible or definite content, a *pure disruption* in the fabric of political being which sets everything awry, after which *the world turns upside down*. Politics closes its heart to the sacral and the eternal (which had betrayed it), and is left with nothing but the angst of contradiction, and the necessity of *grounding itself* in terms and by means *wholly accountable and knowable to itself*. Divine right, which for so long suspended the political into the embrace of the unknowable and eternal, is replaced *by virtue of its own impossibility* by rational modern statehood, which suspends the political into a man-made institutional sanction.

It is in the paradoxical attempts at restoring unity and giving *pure form* to this *pure discontinuity* that a definite and irreducible *division* appears at the heart of modern politics. The *division* into *change* and *order*, is the self-division of pure difference *by means of its transubstantiation into pure form*. Order, one the one hand, is nothing more than the *pure form* of pure difference, taken as something complete. Change, on the other, is nothing more than the affect *this same difference and the attempt to give pure form thereof* has on a status quo defined by some otherwise substantive content (rather than

the pure form of difference), i.e. *ancien regime* (hence the inevitable failure of every *party of order* which is doomed to be overthrown by the same means of its establishment, *the conservative today is the liberal of yesterday*).

The common denominator is of course *formalism*, for which *pure contradiction* is, in the first place an impossibility that must be immediately expounded into a definite and one-sided form. Yet this limitation is not shared by the immortal science of (((Marxism))-Leninism, according to which *contradiction is itself* something real, and immanent to objects. But this formalism is not merely an error of political theory. It is what defines the historical epoch of the bourgeoisie and the capitalist mode of production as we know it. It is not merely a way of representing the world in thought, *it is a way of relating to the world in reality*: From the perspective of its *reduction* into universal form.

The failure of said reduction is the history of modernity. And in particular, the history of *modern politics*, whose own division - into left and right - attests to the impossibility of such a reduction. However, it likewise attests to the impossibility of the bourgeoisie and the capitalist mode of production being the final forms of history. Something even deeper, that is, subterrestrial underlies this conflict between 'left and right,' which reveals itself inadvertently in the process of revolutionary change. And suddenly, the topology of the political division becomes confusing, dizzying and disorienting. Left becomes Right, and Right becomes Left. Smoke grenades obscure the position of *guerrillas by night*, firing, apparently, from all directions.

The bourgeoisie, in their vain attempt at achieving universal formal political unity, finds itself under siege by a kind of terrorist which has no regard for the modern purity of form at all. That is *the partisan*.

The Partisan Revolutionary

The political spectrum can be defined as the metaphysical theory of *political alignment*. Its formalism consists in the fact that it makes no distinction between political alignment in *actual reality* - that is to say, what position one bares in relation to real political power, real political contradictions, etc. - and political alignment as formally represented by abstract values and principles.

Even strictly taken from the perspective of information warfare, it cannot properly locate where a given ideological tendency *actually* aligns in regards to the political. Abstract ‘values’ and principles are located alongside a formal - and supposedly impartial spectrum. Rather than categorize where a given pattern of information *actually* aligns, for example, with the *actual* form of the *actually existing* state, it categorizes ideological information in terms of where it imagines or purports to be.

For example, the alignment of breadtubers is defined by how they think society *should* be governed or wish it to be governed. But no regard is placed for what relationship the *information* of such ‘values’ have to the *way* it is actually governing now. It might *appear* contrary, and thus *appear* revolutionary, but as *forms* of information they do not challenge the existing state. “I think we should live in a stateless society” might *seem* apparently contradictory with a status quo where a state is very much still existing. Yet political alignment is really defined by what relation it bares to the *actual form* of state power.

The grounding of political power based on contrived moral consensus fully aligns with the existing modern state. Ones ‘values’ about how society ‘should look like,’ shares the same position of enunciation with regard to society as the modern state, having as its addressee not a specific segment of society, but it’s same universal addressee. A breadtuber speaks to America in a way not dissimilar to the President. So it should come as no surprise that in actual content, the breadtuber ends up as a force of propaganda for the President’s *actual* (rather than preferred by the imagination) governance.

One could of course be an anarchist who critiques just about every single thing the government does. Yet most often, even said information aligns with the overhaul of the policy-making apparatus long underway, being subjected to the contrived moral consensus of the ‘Open Society.’ Not so much the specificity of their criticisms, but the *subjective vantage point* from which said criticisms are made is what defines their real political content. You can be fully aligned with the modern state power, even when criticizing its policies and decisions - because the *way* you are criticizing them can reproduce its *subjective standpoint* in consciousness.

Thus, there is an acute difference between *actual* political alignment, and *formal*

political alignment. Real political difference does not manifest itself at different locations on the same formal map of politics, but between *real politics* and the *map itself*. That also means there is an acute difference between an actual *left-wing* alignment, and *leftism* (the same is true for the Right). Leftism and Rightism are *ideologies of formal political alignment*, that cannot tell the truth about any *actual* Left-Wing and Right-Wing position.

An actual *political position* - which is not based on ones ideal stance, but their *real, subjective* stance - cannot be grounded in any formal continuum of political representation. Real political division begins only at the site of an acute *discontinuity*, based, as Clausewitz understands, on an absolute enmity or contradiction. Establishing an alternative political spectrum is thus an impossibility. Political spectrums are themselves political. And the political spectrum is inherently 'leftist,' though not *left-wing* in *its* actual alignment.

Leftism is a *theory* or *ideology* of left-wing alignment. Since all modern politics has its origins in a revolutionary change that entailed the complete leveling of politics into the pure form that knows no distinction in content, any *theory of modern political alignment* is going to be 'leftist.' And in actual fact, the 'left wing' is nothing more than a political *misalignment*, which is situated outside the bounds of modern political form. *Leftism* thus is nothing more than the ideology by which *modern politics* copes about its own real origins, and therefore its real alterity.

The Left can be defined as a modern politics of change, or a wayward path of political modernity.

During the French Revolution of 1789, the politics of change was immediately revolutionary, world-changing. Because no institution of modernity was established, participating in this politics was to participate in something truly new, truly unprecedented, with a truly undecided conclusion.

With the final consolidation of liberal democracy after WWI, 'politics of change' actually becomes, in a sense, conservative. The established institutions of modernity make 'political progress and change' an inevitability. Eventually, leftism just fulfills an agenda already established outside politics.

On the other hand the Right can be defined by a modern politics of order, or the metaphysics of political modernity. The first Rightist was Hobbes. During the French Revolution, the Rightists were the Thermidorians and the elements of the bourgeoisie which wanted to emulate the English model, where the king is just a puppet of the ruling class.

But, permanent order is destroyed at the level of established politics in liberal democracy. So, order of a deeper and more fundamental kind has to be sought after. But then, conservatives become revolutionary (*konservative revolutionary*), like in the 1979 Iranian revolution, where deeper order was found in Islam.

Enter Carl Schmitt's theory of the partisan. *Partisanship* is itself a political alignment, regardless of where internet retards try to situate it on their stupid little 'political spectrum.' Partisanship entails an actual *political position* - which means *actual contestation* for political power. The partisan *goes down to the people*, repeating the origin of modern statehood by returning it to its real (rather than formal) premises.

Partisans are not leftists. But they are also not rightists either. The Partisan irregular stands opposed to the standardized order of the regular army. From the perspective of the regular army (order), It is a force of chaos. But it is deeply terrestrial, earthly, with a profound attachment to the soil of the nation, and the *deeper order* of rural life.

But how this order will come to be *established* is always undecided. The partisan is a true force of change, precisely because it bases itself in what is truly eternal. Think about the Islamic partisans devoted to the eternal creator, or, the partisan like Che Guevara devoted to eternal principles like justice and dignity.

The leftist just takes this real order for granted, and the way in which it has already become *established* by the institutions of political modernity. The 'revolutionary' leftist introduces change with the regularity and banality of a Windows update. But the partisan continues to have an active relation to *real and true* order, and thus, an active relation to the premises of revolutionary change.

The partisan is ultimately *left-wing*, because they are *revolutionary*. Yet the left-wing nature of the partisan is *ancillary*, and *incidental*. They are ultimately *coded* as left-wing

because they are *engaged* in a process revolutionary political change. But on the other hand, they fulfill the authentic kernel of the right, which is the resolution of modernity's antagonism into order - only in a way entirely contrary to the rightist: The *resolution into order* becomes a *gesture* of revolutionary partisanship.

And so already with the partisan arises a most fundamental disruption of the *political spectrum* of bourgeois modernity. The partisan *comes from below*, resolving the apparent contradiction between left-and-right by introducing an entirely new dimension of political alignment. It does not 'unite' or 'synthesize' left and right, it rather displaces the contradiction between them into a radically new form. It displaces the 'left and right' distinction by articulating that distinction into an entirely new continuum of counter-hegemonic political space.

The partisan is thus genuinely and radically *revolutionary*, representing something destructive with regard to modern bourgeois politics. The partisan *embodies* change, *is* change, but change in the form of the *sublation*, or resolution of the existing order, accelerating its development toward its real conclusion. It is the political agent at the end of history for which change is a moment in the development of an order more eternal than can be given form by modern statehood.

Leftists, meanwhile, believe in some *doctrine*, some *principles*, some theory of *abstract change*, domesticated change, distilled change *for its own sake*. And in actual reality, they participate in no political change at all. They subscribe to the *religion* of change, which is in actuality the putrescence of stagnation.

The leftist is in fact the greatest enemy of the *partisan*, not simply because they have contrary values, but *contrary subjectivities*. Leftism represents the highest development of the bourgeois political ideology, which is based on what is supposed to be the *ultimate form* of change. Leftism is the ideology of American unipolar imperialism, the highest stage of bourgeois political modernity, which seeks to formalize not only all politics, but all culture, society, etc. under the principle of universal formal equality.

Leftism grounds politics not in *partisanship*, but in some supposedly universal morality, and the fundamental enduring *fact* of political antagonism vindicates the leftist's sense of smug self-satisfied superiority. Political conflict endures - not because of any

fundamental contradiction grounding politics - but because people are too reactionary, too fascist, too immoral, or too stupid to accept the supposedly universal values of leftism. For leftists, enmity is not so much based on the friend-enemy distinction of any concrete struggle, but a vicious, savage inhumanity toward all those who fall outside their own discursive community, in a way that is structurally identical to the worst aspects of European racism and Nazism.

They thus represent the quintessential target of true absolute enmity for the political partisan, being an agential manifestation of the universal modern state itself, a kind of killer surveillance-bot designed to exterminate would-be partisans. The enmity toward leftists shared by partisans is not simply based in ideological disagreements or conflicts in values. It is like the enmity reserved toward a snitch, whose sole mission is to eliminate and give away the partisans position against its state enemy. On a certain level, it is not even personal. The very alignment of their contrary subjectivities pit them against one and another in a war of absolute annihilation.

Leftism is an ideology of *leveling* and *standardization*, flattening out stratified socio-political terrain into conventional smooth-space. The leftist, being therefore an agent of *universal surveillance*, raising every point of political contention, antagonism, and contradiction to the status of striation on the topography of universal political form (to be smoothed over, i.e. #BLM!). The partisan irregular, by nature, occupies points of antagonistic contradiction, and thus situates its position toward *content* rather than *form*. The partisan has no regard for any 'political spectrum' or *representation* of politics, *it embodies political antagonism itself*.

The class struggle within *political alignment* can thus be understood as between *leftism* and *partisanship*. In the contradiction between universal statehood and civil society stand two opposing reconciliations: Standing on the side of the bourgeoisie lies the *expansion* of universal statehood, articulating the contradiction in the terms of the inexhaustive universality of the state (the state is not 'big' enough). Standing on the side of the proletariat lies the transformation of civil society into a site of guerrilla warfare, articulating the contradiction in the terms of the *outmoding* of the bourgeois state (i.e. as *condemned to the dustbin of history*).

Insofar as civil society confronts the universal state as discordant or mis-aligned with it,

civil society confronts the universal state as a *security flaw* which must be *patched*. This first takes the form of the gross expansion of military-police powers, not the least of which include surveillance. On the cultural front, however, it also takes the form of the expansion of a completely sanitized *artificial* or *institutionalized* civil society compatible with the universal state. At a certain point in the acceleration of the development of the historical class struggle, the real existence of civil society had become a crisis of national security.

Here lies, in part, the origin of the *Open Society*, the apparently decentralized network of NGOs, academic, nonprofit, activist, etc. institutions which, although not directly subjected to the sovereign will of the state, are by nature of their form and design mechanisms for the filtration of civil society into a compatible, sanitized, transparent, open, and overt form. The bourgeois state, having successfully secured itself militarily against armed partisan combatants - and furthermore, having secured civil society (protest, unrest, etc.) into a compatible, sanitized form - appears to have made partisanship impossible.

The dialectic of the partisan and the bourgeois state should be thought of like a game of whack-a-mole. The partisan occupies all the places the state is not looking, which can be heuristically represented in the form of abstract subterrestrial space. Globality, the highest concept of modern geography, refers to the smooth and non-local continuum of open and abstract space, a kind of grid which aligns entire sovereign states as connective nodes for the facilitation of goods, people, and most importantly *information*. At the apex lies, uniting heaven and earth, the contemporary value-form (i.e. the petrodollar) of financial capital.

American sovereignty thus does not lie at the apex of the American unipolar system. That notion remains confined, still, to the narrow Hobbesian political metaphysics. At the apex of the American unipolar system lies in the reproduction of fictitious capital, or the global financial network based in Wall Street and the City of London, which aligns all sovereign states, including the American (its *first citizen*) as connective nodes within the *continuum* of its universal reproduction and circulation. Politically speaking, the globality of American unipolarity finds its *articulation*, or its *expression*, in the *institutions* of the *open society* (and finds its *operational security* in the *deep state*) - which chiefly establish, a la Gramsci, its cultural hegemony.

Politics, then, becomes downstream from this *cultural* hegemony, and this is at the outset in the form of *policy-making*. NGOs, think-tanks, universities, lobbyists, etc. - all manifestations of unipolar *globalism* (propped into existence with the help of the CIA laundering Rockefeller money) do not at the outset change the form of the state. But they change the nature of how individuals are elected, how laws are made, and what policies are enacted. Fictitious capital and its reproduction, standing at the apex of the unipolar system, is not simply a blind process of accumulation either. It increasingly takes the form of *economic information-signaling*, transforming itself into an extremely dynamic form of *economic planning*, operationalizing information for the distribution of credit.

Information, as a matter of fact, is the modern aesthetic at the end of history, the final form of forms, political or otherwise. The Open Society is chiefly an *information-laundering* network. Information - immanent formation - is the *implosion* of the modern universal form. In keeping with capitalism's creative destruction, this *implosion* has itself been *operationalized* for the purpose of the reproduction of the *value-form*: *Open and free* information means *compatible* information, that is, compatible with the modern form (which is abstract, negative, universal, etc.). The *information* of science, universal values, finance, etc. metonymically related to the *Godhead* of unipolarity.

Here lies the significance of *leftism*, which is the pure and distilled ideology of open information. *Leftism* means *trusting the science*, open values, the latest news cycle (Ukraine, #BLM, etc.) - a definite cognitive disorder which *fully aligns* the mind with the unipolar system. *Leftism* is not the actual heir to the historical left-wing politics originating in the French Revolution, but is rather an information security machine which imposes the *affect* of political and cultural change by means of *asserting* information aligned with the status quo, on a society constantly suspended in a state of flux. Thus the affect of change arises from imposing a *dead* order on a *living* one that is increasingly, owing to the development of the productive forces, escaping its grasp.

Leftism is a type of *mental retardation*, according to which the latest 'open' agenda constitutes real historical change. Yet in reality, such an agenda is *already set outside* of politics, and is entirely foreseeable beforehand. It is set by the nature of the 'open' global system, whose veneer of openness conceals a radical closedness toward *true alterity*, and *true historical change*, which it suppresses with violent force. *Leftism* is the

muscadin, the death squad, the white terrorism of American unipolarity, sent down to ‘open’ all sectors of society to ensure its proper alignment with the system as producers and consumers of information.

Information has become the most important battlespace of modern warfare. Having been rooted out of its position in both armed combat and civil society, the partisan revolutionary has retreated into *information warfare*. Information warfare is the final form of modern war, because it is the site within which universal modern form itself undergoes immanent contestation. In all hitherto spaces of warfare, the modern state could take for granted a basic distinction between the sphere of its own exercise of will, operational capabilities, and identity - and the sphere of criminality outside of it.

Yet in the age of information warfare, the modern state is infiltrated from within. Its very ability to *inform*, that is, *take form* and *reality* within the consciousness of the people, can be directly hijacked with irregular hit-and-run, swarm, etc. tactics by partisan info-warriors (i.e. the 2016 and 2020 elections). Of course, the partisan is principally a political (mis)alignment in general - but information warfare represents the most advanced (but by no means exclusive) sphere of activity for the partisan of today. It is the sphere within which dis-alignment from the global system becomes immediately possible at the level of consciousness - a process sociologists call ‘radicalization.’

As a category of *polarity*, alignment refers to ones place in relation to the continuum of a given globality. The global system of alignment includes a very atypical geographical form of the relation between *urbanity* and *rurality*. Rather than being spaces separated by distance (though, they often are), they are chiefly separated by the relation they bare to the global continuum. Thus, an Airbnb in the middle of Idaho is in a way ‘urban,’ and a decaying neighborhood in Los Angeles can in a way be ‘rural.’ Rurality is not necessarily misaligned with the global system, it rather has the potential to be. Being ‘overlooked’ (i.e. ‘flyover states’), it has the chief potential to give rise to malign sovereignties, or counter-hegemonic, *partisan* kinds of politics - from Islamic fundamentalism to Militia Movement, from bugaloo boys to black guerrilla movements (incl. the early panthers).

The limit of Carl Schmitt’s concept of the partisan lies in his Hobbesian formalism - being unable to define the partisan except by *what he is not*, i.e. only by the opposition he poses to standardized order, a type of rebel-without- a-cause. The friend-enemy

distinction upon which the concept of enmity is based, alongside the definition of the partisan in terms of unconventionality represent the concept of the partisan from the perspective of anti-partisan operations. But partisanship can also be defined by a specific Hegelian *sublation* of established political distinction, representing a type of political subject interpellated by a *new* form of universal statehood - the Kojevean *Empire*, polarity, or determinate globality.

The fertile soil of rurality is what gives rise to the germ of a *determinate* and *particular* globality - not the universal open society of globalism, but a society enclosed, or defined by its very specific limitation, way of life, or *terrestrial character*. The post-Mongol Asiatic Land Empires of the early modern period, as well the modern Communist states which in many ways revived them can be defined precisely in the form of this type of universal statehood. Because rurality, representing the definite limitation and *real basis* of universal modern statehood, can give rise to malign sovereignties - it must be brutally kept in line by the modern state. The idiocy and banality of rural life must be maintained so no outbreak occurs. Rural people, therefore, are not modern individual subjects, but treated as a type of livestock. Thus, the limit of the modern universal form, is also for it a site of enmity, criminality, terrorism, and malign sovereignty ("Fascism").

But for Mongol universal statehood, the limit of the state is the *stamp* of its *identity* and *character* rather than its *inadequacy*. It is the *source* of its vital power. The modern state is *founded* on *keeping at bay* and *denying* its own source in rural life. But as soon as a clear discord arises between the source and the sovereign in the *Land Empire*, the sovereign is immediately deposed (as in the case of the overthrow of the Yuan dynasty by the Ming) - no prolonged state of gross oppression is possible. The Land Empires are thus *Partisan Empires* which, rather than impose standard order at the expense of a people's particular reality, *contrive* order on their basis: Universal statehood is defined by its own reality and not just its form. Its form comes to be defined, in fact, by this reality. These Empires' sovereignty are themselves inherently *partisan*, that is defined in content by the terrestrial reality which forms their real foundation, rather than a formal 'state' of being which attempts, in vain, to artificially establish its own premises.

The present era of multi-polarity has revealed that the historical continuity of the Asiatic Land Empires remains intact, and that their decline - in the form of colonialism, modern conflict, pauperization, and subjugation to the West - was only a transitory and

temporary blip in the long process of their historical development. The unipolar system of American globalism is now faced with the emergence of *determinate globalities* - contrary and unique polarities which inhere all the dynamism, technological and cultural development, etc. of the American global system without the conceit of abstract formal universality. Here lies the true, material, and vital source of so-called 'Fascism:' the objective breakdown of the American unipolar system by virtue of its own internal contradictions.

The true threat posed by *malign sovereignties* - rogue states - consists not in the fact that they are geopolitical anarchists - but that they are aligned with entirely contrary and different polarities, which serve as the germ of a new global system - one that will, rather than culminate in the 'opening' of exchange-value, culminate in the determinate 'closed' character, necessities for the development of, and interaction between peoples. This true end of history which culminates, finally, in *malign globality* (ever wondered what the Infrared symbol means?), globality pregnant with the development of *determinate civilizations* and peoples - is the malign 'plain of immanence' out of which *all counter-hegemonic politics* is being spawned from the future.

The distinction between left and right is displaced by the distinction between Leftism (which increasingly takes, in political reality, the form of an 'apolitical Center') and Partisanship, the latter including all manner of eclectic, wild, fringe ideologies which appear 'all over the political spectrum.' It appears as such, not because of any mystical 'Nazbol vortex' or profound metaphysical significance of fascism - but because it represents, in the final analysis, a *denial* of modern political form itself. In contrast to 'third position syncretism,' partisan political ideologies are properly *chaotic*, being defined only by their *unpredictability* from the standpoint of modern political consciousness.

While today's partisanship is associated with the 'far right,' that is only since each partisan ideology has thus far culminated in a type of cult, dogma, confusion, or impotence that, taken separately, immobilize partisan political struggle. Not unlike the various forms of socialism outlined in the *Communist Manifesto*. Political ideologies which seek to return to, or discover *true order* are contrived in opposition to the 'Leftist' one prevailing. Yet taken individually, they fail to pose any challenge. Taken together, they represent only the general form of enmity with the status quo, and are thus,

together, represented as the ‘far right’ - the ‘abyss’ which, for liberal consciousness (and, admittedly, some fringe ideologists themselves), ends with Nazism. Yet it is not any *general* far-right political ideology which defines these partisan ideologies *taken together*, only the *general form* of (potentially) malign political sovereignty.

Politics around the world have become globalized, which is to say *Americanized*. Leftism, even now in Latin America, where left-wing partisans had been the most formidable opponents to American imperialism - has increasingly come to mean the same thing. German leftism today is indistinguishable from the American kind, meanwhile, the ‘far-right’ partisan movements like the AfD attempt to recuperate natively East German Communist traditions. And this tendency is rapidly spreading to every corner of the globe. A decisive confrontation within modern politics is brewing in nearly every country which represents the greatest political realignment of the modern era, *not the least including in the United States itself*.

The Red American Sun

In the United States, the *MAGA Movement* has come to be defined by being the exclusive *American form of partisanship*. As is well known, the distinction between the Republicans and Democrats, in nearly every election cycle, has never amounted to any real *political* distinction on the basis of Clauswitzian absolute enmity. Partisanship, that is *impassioned political partiality*, has made its definite return in the United States solely in the MAGA movement, which has again reintroduced real political enmity and distinction to the belly of the globalist beast itself. Having its origins in a rather accidental confluence of circumstances, in Donald Trump’s presidential election in 2016, the movement has become the host of every possible real counter-hegemonic ideological tendency within the Untied States.

MAGA has come to be defined by terrestrial America, bizarro America, alternative timeline America, other America, flyover America, etc. - and has arisen as a kind of malignant *tulpa* of the globalist Untied States. A *terrestrial* version, one that is somehow not aligned with the American-led global system itself, and which carries the germ of a type of sovereignty that can definitively break out of the unipolar global system, and deliver it *its final nail in the coffin*. It is as though America *split* with itself in a process of asexual reproduction, only to expose its dark other (the dark other being the globalist

establishment!). And the basis of this lies in none other than the *American working class*, upon whose backs the globalists came to power in the first place, and which therefore have unfinished business with them.

The MAGA movement has taken form as the movement of a people deposed of their hitherto sovereign representation, and therefore a people now struggling to receive the calling of their *true* polarity. It spawns, like an unstable vacuum deprived of its element, a whole multitude of contradictory superstitions projecting into the sky, *being the soil out of which sovereigns, states and polarities make themselves born*. For the architects of the global system, the American working class was the most overlooked and underestimated element, but in the end, it, alongside the public works and infrastructure of the New Deal, was the true basis and engine of the American economy. The extravagant designs of the ‘progressive globalists,’ like the Rockefellers, simply took them for granted. As in the case of the metabolic rift created in industrial capitalism described by (((Marx))), where capital accumulation leads to the depletion of its own premises in the soil, the MAGA movement is the product of a political metabolic rift between the state and its own popular premises.

It thrusts to the fore the basic question: *Did America have to culminate in what it is today?* Or, *beginning from the very same premises*, would an entirely different outcome have been possible? Make America Great Again, really means *roll the dice again, repeat* (with all the Deleuzian connotations) the *origin* of America, *Reset American history. Return America to the mercy of its progenitor*. Nothing could evince the sign of middle-class midwifery consciousness and historical nihilism more than the slogan ‘America was never great.’ America was great. It was great *when it was other* than what it only seems now, when it was *latent* with culminating into *something else*, a time that has been *forgotten* because it is impossible to remember. A time *passed over*, echoing forever into the annals of a lost past, lost but still *felt* like *deja vu* - like a trace memory from the future. MAGA is *there* in *real America* and not *here* in the *empire of lies*: whose most principal and founding lie consists in the notion that the highest necessity of Spirit culminates in the now of putrescent modernity.

The revulsion toward ‘MAGA’ as a slogan evinces the most base level of undialectical philistinism and glasses-wearing snobbery, betraying the sentiments of a class unwilling to submit to material reality. The favorite shrill of the ‘democratic socialists’ and leftists:

“Another world is possible!” is the solipsistic escapism of gentrifiers and airy-fairy social parasites unable to ground their position in any true *necessity*. MAGA makes clear that its virtual projection - *the great America* - is grounded in concrete necessity, and therefore something real, which is why it must be made great *again*, even if, technically, there was never a single point in history that suffices to define this greatness. MAGA does not want to return to a *period* of time, it wants to return to the *premises* of technomic American time itself, which is wanting of a *malign sovereign* (which they have found in the ‘Great MAGA King’ himself, Trump). MAGA represents a *complete reversal* of chronological ‘American progressivism’ culminating outward into the boundless ‘open Atlantic sea’ of the globalist open society, establishing a temporal flux bending backwards toward *rugged*, and *ultimately metallic* Earth.

It is even a funny irony that Donald Trump - known for his association with gold, has emerged as the symbolic patron saint of this movement. Perhaps one day, the colors of the American flag should change, from *blue* to *gold*, to symbolize this alchemical transformation from Atlantic waters to Earthly, metallic gold. Gold is, after all, the ultimate elemental principle of telluric societies as the most perfect Earthly Good, the sovereign radiance emanating from the Earthly work of the people, the product of work that is at the same time its ultimate driving aim. Gold, *real wealth*, is after all a common color on flags representing the workers dictatorship for this same reason. And MAGA is irrefutably the only worker’s political movement that exists in America. The American *working class* (the ‘mecha proletariat,’ defined by its ownership of the means of augmenting its labor power - trucks, tools, etc.) forms the fundamental core without which MAGA ceases to possess the force of political independence. Without it, all other social stratum surrounding it easily scatter to the wind, having no independent ground for their existence.

Even small business owners (the so-called ‘boat dealers’ as they are called by the declassed, lumpen-bourgeois malformoids of Chapo) do not possess the same social independence from the Open Society that the great MAGA working class majority does. Representing the most immediate and *general* aspirations of *labor*, the MAGA movement is at the outset characterized by the demand for the return of manufacturing and a revival of industrial production. But merely seeking a ‘return of old jobs,’ a common faux-Marxist analysis prevailing among the liberal intelligentsia, only scratches the

surface as far as the aspirations of MAGA are concerned. Rather than a naive attempt to turn back the wheels of time, demanding the return of manufacturing jobs reveals the aspiration for establishing *an entirely different timeline*, the development of which having its basis in an entirely different ends and aims than that driving current economic development - and therefore, an entirely contrary basis of sovereign power. The true aspiration of the MAGA movement is a *new sun*, a *red sun*, whose dawn retrochronically establishes its prior occlusion into the night sky.

The red sun - or red star - is the most persistent and elemental symbol of *Communism*. Communism means the arrival of an *alien*, yet also tangentially familiar sun, an abrupt discontinuity of the seamless continuum of capitalist modernity's pure form. Communism awakens a *lost* and *forgotten* past, first represented in Soviet consciousness as the revolutionary history of humanity (among the first measures of the Bolsheviks were the erection of statues to French revolutionaries, meanwhile, the ballet *Spartacus* is still popularly performed in today's Rural Russia). This ideology is also clear in Stalin's Soviet Union, which moved its capital back to historical Moscow, reviving the glorious past of Ivan the Terrible and Alexander Nevsky, to the point where the Romanov dynasty, once seen as a symbol of Asiatic backwardness, became considered too Western and 'modern'. Finally China, which is now embarking on the Great Rejuvenation of Chinese Civilization, is tapping into the annals of its five thousand year old past under the guidance of the Communist party.

And the most fundamental purport of *MAGA Communism* (falsely labeled as 'patriotic socialism,' which connotes *institutional* loyalty to the state) is that *a red sun is rising in America*, concluding the tragical history of the modern West as we know it. *Bourgeois modernity* has its origins in the West, and the development of the history of the West has corresponded to the liquidation of histories, peoples, and civilizations. England was the *culmination* of the chronology of the West, which has finally *ended* in America. And so the question stands, in the age of multi-polarity and the resurgence of the true history of mankind, as to whether the entire history of the West consists in one, meaningless and accidental disaster - whether America is the most irredeemable, unnatural, Frankenstein bastard of world history that can only hope to await destruction (as Heidegger believed). The error of this temptation neglects that it is mankind itself which had given birth to the West, and that, therefore, the development of Western

history tells something about mankind in general.

As easy as it may seem to blame Europeans for some exceptional evil by virtue of a defect unique to them, the truth is that Europe's evil only reflects the evil of mankind in general, as an inseparable part of its universal world history. The supposedly 'third worldist' 'decolonial' intellectuals, who are often social-democratic moralizers, are always revealed to be prostitutes of Western globalism anyway. They do not confront the history of the West, they rather leverage moral blackmail in order to benefit from it in some way, not only continuing to take for granted its fundamental evil, but coming to represent this same evil themselves (i.e. moralizing universalism, liquidationism, woke globalism, etc.). MAGA has definitively proven, at the end of the era of Anglo-Saxon hegemony, that there is more to the history of the West. Unipolar globalism (and its forebear in, colonialism, imperialism, slavery, etc.) is only *one* outcome of the history of the West. Concurrent with this same history is the *lost chronology* of the genuine development of its civilizations and peoples, found at the point of the historical soil's *tilling* at the bottom, rather than at the point of history's *opening* at the top.

America does have a real history, and is not simply a Frankenstein accident. A genuine civilizational encounter between different peoples has characterized the history of its development, even from the very beginning of its settlement by Europeans. The historical nihilism of the globalists seeks to erase from the memory of the people this lost history of America, up to and including its greatest literary and artistic treasures. The American people, and the European peoples before them, were not inherently disposed of the genocidal intentionality of universal formal modernity. In fact, those most disposed of this universalist, genocidal, and liquidationist intentionality today are Western *leftists* and their financial capitalist sugar-daddies, who are the staunchest enemies of the MAGA movement. The American people have risen up against the same evil, arrogance, and satanism that has plagued the history of the West, and therefore the history of the world, to reclaim the *real America*, and therefore rescue the lost history of the West that engendered it. Here, and not in the distant past of ancient Greece, lies the true *other beginning*.

Now may begin the era of true American civilization, freed from the shackles of the European past, and oriented toward the future of a genuinely novel development without precedent. *This is what it means to make America great again, to return to the lost*

history of America whose future is genuinely undecided. Together, with the rest of resurgent mankind, America may then help to build the glorious future for all humanity, as a worthy member of the great Land Empires of the world. MAGA Communists believe that in order to realize is true, objective and fundamental striving, the immortal and invaluable science of (((Marxism))-Leninism will be necessary in order to give proper clarity, articulation, and insight into the host of social, historical and political forces which represent both the greatest allies and enemies of the MAGA movement. The unity of Communism with MAGA is nothing more than the unity of (((Marxism))) with the worker's movement. But this unity will not be accomplished by attempting to enforce the condescending tone-policing of Western Marxists, but by a genuine praxiological encounter between Communist partisans and the people.

Leftists sneer at MAGA Communists owing to the supposedly unbridgeable rift between Communism and the MAGA movement. But they are themselves the prime cause, and the greatest beneficiaries of such a rift in the first place! It is the betrayal of the revisionists, and the traitors to the working class movement - career climbing through institutional academia, NGOs and ultimately the highest levels of government - that has earned Communism the dirty name that it has now acquired in America. The 'communists,' sitting at their posts as the most vicious representatives of the professional managerial class, are themselves chiefly to blame for the unpopularity of Communism. It is thus inevitable that the greatest enemies of the MAGA Communist movement will be leftists, who stand the most to lose from the unity of (((Marxism))) with the worker's movement. It will outmode them into irrelevance, and turn the ideology that has for so long been the sanction of their parasitism and evil into the weapon of social forces disposed with the intention of *liquidating them as a class*.

Communism means the real movement of the working class united with working class consciousness. It means a party *by for and of* the working people, because the working class represents the universal and common interests of society as a whole in actual reality. The critique of private property entailed by Communism does not mean that Communists seek to *voluntarily* change all property relations. Rather, it means an opposition to economic nihilism, according to which the productive forces of society serve inhuman, alien, and antisocial ends. The reign of the institution of private property is not what guarantees peoples liberty to have their own homes, land,

farmsteads, businesses, or *things that they actually use* in general in the pursuit of happiness. It is what destroys them. The ruling class has deceived the American people into thinking 'private property' means having your own shit. But what it actually means are banks and blackrock *stealing your shit*.

Communists do not want to 'socialize' people's actual belongings or even businesses. The way in which actual relations of production will develop will be a matter of history. (((Marx)) & Engels) that through the course of the actual development of the productive forces, the institution of private property will become superfluous, because productive relations will develop as forms of free association - production will have a substantive human quality based on relations between people, rather than abstractions like money. Communists do not want to *force* this outcome on people, but allow it to happen. It could not happen at the expense of what the people want, it could only happen as a result of the people's own historical development. In the meantime, what Communists seek is the overthrow of the monopolists, the bankers, big pharma, big agriculture, big tech, and others - which have hijacked the American republic in the name of the 'sacred institution of private property.'

The Communist critique of private property allows for pro-people policies, including lowering taxation, ending government subsidies for the monopolists, and removing red tape - to actually happen, because it places the interests of the people above the interests of money and so-called 'private property.' Communists want the people to have *more* things, not less - *more* wealth, *more* businesses, and *more* prosperity. If the people have more of these things, than the productive forces accelerate faster, unleashing human prosperity and creativity to the point where things like Wall Street, the City of London, and other enemies of the people will never have the chance to take power again. The critique of private property doesn't mean taking property away from people. It means using political power in a way that serves the common interests of the people, rather than the private interests of money. The contractual forms of association between the people - which allow people to secure their rights of ownership - will continue to exist far into the future, and will only disappear when they are rendered unnecessary by the productive forces - when no institutional *challenge* to their ownership will even exist.

By contrast, leftists and the 'democratic socialists' want to expand our rotten and corrupt government to step on the toes of the American people, beyond the bounds of

their rights and constitutional liberties. Just like the Nazis before them, their ‘socialism’ means an expansion of the corporate-state power, securing the monopolies of Bill Gates, the Rockefellers, the Federal Reserve bankers and others by eliminating all possibility of competition with them. They plan on ‘financing’ their ‘socialism’ by raising taxes, which the moneyed interests have no problem doing as it is a price well paid for securing their thousand-year-reich monopolies. Meanwhile, they want to raise taxes on regular working Americans, who are already being ‘taxed’ to death through debt and banks. ‘You’ll own nothing and be happy’ - that is the socialism the elites have planned for the American people. And the only way to defeat their socialism, which has more in common with Hitler’s kind than the Soviet or Chinese, is with Communism, which will take away the source of their power. Communism turns the tables against the globalists, telling them: *You will not own our country, and we don’t care if it makes you unhappy!*

No one denies that Communism is unpopular among the MAGA movement. The overt consciousness of the MAGA movement is obviously characterized by all manner of anti-Communist views. For many conspiracists, Communism is the theory behind the globalist enemy and the ‘forces which have hijacked our government.’ This theory retains its coherence because it possesses a grain of truth: Leftism is indeed the hegemonic ideology of the American unipolar empire, and globalist politics can indeed trace back to international social-democracy, the Fabian socialists, and others. The cultural agenda of the globalists, furthermore, inherits much from the New Left, and ex-Communists are well represented among them. What we witness is not any inherent indictment on the MAGA movement being *essentially* anti-Communist, but the most immediate ‘home-made’ theories and consciousness the American working class is disposed of.

Drawing from the reactionary populist legacy of the McCarthyite era and the John Birch society, as well as cold-war propaganda, ‘anti-Communist’ sentiment is as American as apple pie. Taken from that perspective, the anti-Communism of the MAGA movement is even in a way endearing, reflecting its grassroots nature. People are simply making constructs out of old materials already laying around at home. To view this as some kind of *essential* indictment on the possibility of the dissemination of Communist ideas, or the compatibility between Communism and the MAGA movement is pure philistine idiocy. MAGA is not *essentially* defined by anti-Communism. It is, in the first place,

essentially defined by being the American form of counter-hegemonic partisan politics, attempting to *reground* politics on the basis of the *terrestrial homeland* of the American working class rather than the ‘values’ of the globalist ‘open society.’

That being said, the development of the modern Right is at least tangentially related to the emergence of the MAGA movement and the partisan itself. And so on that basis, it - as well as the immediate (and failed) right-wing ideologies which attempt to give articulation and consciousness to the MAGA movement - is necessary of worthy consideration.

The Impossibility of Rightist Politics

The problem with all of today’s ‘Rightist’ politics is that, when it becomes a definite ideology and definite community - with very few exceptions - it stagnates, paralyzes and immobilizes the partisan politics it attempts to give articulation to. Rather than act as a conduit of movement, it acts as a conduit for the formation of enclosed community.

Organic populist movements are constantly ‘spawning’ ideologies, and these, spontaneously, take on a Rightist character, only because they attempt to give immediate articulation to the meaning of the *very real* partisan position that created the *need* for this articulation - with the readymade conceptual tools, prejudices, and ideals of the status quo. It is in a sense similar to the various ‘socialisms’ outlined in the Communist manifesto, which, while anti-capitalist, do not articulate their anti-capitalism in an effective way. Rightist politics will never successfully lead the MAGA movement to victory, because they are outright impossible to have.

The political Right has always been a very real orientation in the history of modern politics. Yet in contrast to the Left, Right-Wing *partisanism* had always been a self-evident absurdity. Mass politics and partisanship are inherently left-wing, for no other reason than that they entail revolutionary political change. The oft-cited examples of Right-Wing mass movements, from the Black Hundreds to Fascism, were actually more like paramilitary police forces, composed primarily of declassed, lumpen elements. Rather than being authentically popular, they rehearsed the spectacle of popular politics as a means of neutralizing and disarming those that actually existed. Today’s LGBT pride parades, or the 2020 BLM protests thus have more in common with the ‘mass

politics' of Fascism than today's MAGA movement.

The Right, like the Left, has its origins in *political modernity*. While the actual *ancien regime*, as well as the world's great religions have often served as the sanction of *real* historically Right-Wing politics, it has done so only in an opportunistic and inauthentic way. Right-Wing politics takes for granted the absolute destruction of the *ancien regime* (taken to be the premodern world in general), only to reassemble it with the same *modern substances* responsible for its destruction. The most honest example of Right-Wing politics were the Thermidorians who, admitting the irreversibility of the revolution, reaped its products in the most shamelessly corrupt way - in the name of establishing the permanence of this new 'revolutionary' order. The Thermidorian Reaction, in contrast to the various Rightist pretensions of returning to the *ancien regime*, represents the most naked and accurate expression of modern Right-Wing politics.

This is in contrast to the English Right, which actually lowered itself to the depravity of reinstating the institution of monarchy after it had *actually* been destroyed. It is as though one murders your father, and then preserves his cadaver for use by a sick, sadistic ventriloquist, pretending that he is still alive. Modern politics pulverizes true, authentic sovereignty based in the embrace of the eternal, into mechanical, simple metaphysical substances (i.e. the form of right). The Right, in an arbitrary and makeshift way - attempts to place reality back together with these substances (like legos), to recreate a once unified order, hierarchy, etc. Both standpoints - Left and Right - base themselves in the Cartesian *Cogito*, reducing all reality to form of universal, alienated thought - just as the reign of capital reduces it to the universal form of exchange (money).

Thus, historical Right-Wing bourgeois defenses of apparently sacred order - the order of monarchy, religion, property, family, etc. - are made as disinterested metaphysical insights. They *defend order* by means that are *anything but* compatible with that same order. *Feudal privilege*, for example, must be *defended* with Bentham, humanism, and progress: If feudal privilege is not maintained, it would spell ruin for society, society would not be able to function, no one could make any money, and people will be less happy. *Feudal privilege* is nowhere to be found in the logos by which it is *defended*. It is not the *Great Chain of Being*, whereby - society, money, and people be damned - *such is*

the law of nature, the law of God, and the law of being. It is *bourgeois* utility, Reason, and justice. Likewise, when the rightist engages in the defense of modern gender norms, they do not do so as *men engaged subjectively in the sacral reality* of gender norms, but as evolutionary psychologists, scientists, etc. - referencing impersonal statistics, data, etc.

They do not *imperil* themselves in the embrace of the sacred they supposedly seek to restore, defend or uphold, in contrast to the partisan guerrilla (like a Hezbollah fighter or Sandinista). Rightists are not hypocrites. They just don't, *themselves*, believe what they say they do. They believe it is necessary for *others*, for the *masses*, for *general stability*. For the maintenance of their revenues in rent and interest. Hence the debauchery, decadence, and libertine nature of most 'rightists.' Today, look no further than the anime loving degenerate. As a matter of fact, today, there are no 'Rightists' to speak of. The degenerate NeoNazi is, aside from the bad-manners of having any public presence, *are Leftists* proper. All of their edginess and depravity, often with the use of Darwinist or biological analogy, is rooted in the exact same metaphysics of the Open Society, employing grotesque, shocking ideological gore as a form as a pornographic tool to 'smooth' political space into the purity of its modern form.

The anime degenerate 'Neo-nazi' stands 'directly opposed' to the leftist only as the contrasting plane on the same möbius strip. The real discontinuity at the heart of modern politics - is 'smoothed over' into a perfect continuum. Thus, such nihilistic degenerates have now taken the form of the 'compatible Right,' often offering themselves in the criminal employ of leftists and liberal elites, to do the dirty work the former are not willing to. It is precisely here that apparent coalescence is achieved between 'left and right,' apparently doing what the syncretic third positivists only dreamed of. Right-Wing subjectivity stands apart from the established order it takes for granted (while defending) as a cynic and transgressor. Leftists, as did De Sade (perhaps among the first leftists in history?), only attempt to purify and distill the essence of this transgression: Such that *the private vice of the rightist is the public virtue of the leftist*. Yet with the degenerate neonazi, this private vice becomes an *open secret* - making them effectively indistinguishable from leftists.

Furthermore, since *Leftism* is in fact nothing more than the ideologization (and therefore domestication) of change (rather than *actually being* the politics of change), its existence implies a rather awkward, but increasingly unavoidable fact: *That Leftism is*

actually Right-Wing. Right partisanship *never* manifested in any overt form throughout history. Right politics have only existed at the level of established orders. *Right orientations* in politics never result from any impassioned revolutionary change, but from apparently unavoidable historical outcomes (like the ‘two-steps-back’ NEP policy in the early Soviet Union). Right politics do not imply any change imposed by political partisans, but the inevitable continuity of some existing status quo. In the historical example of Fascism, the banal political continuity of Italian and German state institutions were accompanied by only *apparently* revolutionary pageantry. Yet these also doubled as primitive forms of *information*, representing the pure and distilled ideology of this inertia of liberal modernity, which imposed upon the senses the *affect* of change.

The *true heir* of fascism, is none other than *Leftism itself*. Fascism, like leftism, establishes the dead form of modernity as a pinwheel - a swastika - actively and voluntarily preserving it at the expense of its own real technomic premises, and therefore emanating an affect of revolutionary change. If there is any model worthy of representing the ‘political spectrum’ (which does not actually represent political difference, but rather the political homogeneity of the modern state), it is precisely that of the swastika, as it cannot tilt right without also moving left. The dead form of modernity cannot be preserved, without also emanating the veneer of change. This shocking fact is already self-evident throughout Europe and Ukraine. To call leftists fascists would be superfluous, for leftism is already far more fascist than fascism could ever possibly have been. All the genocidal intent, violence, terrorism and bestiality of fascism is amplified, with far more viciousness, brutality and efficiency in leftism, a fact which is sure to become evident to all in the years to come.

Yet the contrary has also held true in regards to the *Right*. There does indeed exist some continuity between the prevailing ideas of today’s partisans and the ideologies of the historical Right. Yet that is chiefly because the latter have completely changed into *forms of information*. As forms of *information*, right-wing ideologies have come to represent partisanship because they, in a completely independent way, attempt to reground (and basically repeat) the essence of modern order. By *re-presenting modern order*, even if in an apparently identical way, they create an independent basis for political subjectivity. What is so silly about people like Jordan Peterson is how - as the most milquetoast ‘centre-right’ ‘conservative’ of the status quo, he accidentally

represents something *based* - which is the minimum of a politico-ideological subjectivity misaligned with the establishment. Watching Jordan Peterson is a vector in the direction of 'radicalization' - because he is an accidental conduit of malign sovereignty, grounding the validity, truth, or value of thoughts in something other than the legitimate authorities (accredited professors, experts, mainstream media talking heads, etc.).

So-called 'Rightist' ideologists are thus today split between Azovites and the *accidentally based*. The more spontaneous rightist consciousness is, the more potent the partisan element within it. The more impassioned by the contradiction posed between its independence and the modern state, the more it gives expression to a form of based partisanship. Yet as a form of nihilism, perversely indulging in the purity of modern political formalism, it is indistinguishable from leftism. The former 'Rightists', insofar as they can ever be effective political agents, will inevitably become some kind of left-wing partisan in their *actual* alignment. The modern Right, as a form of 'ideological partisanship' is condemned to historical extinction, given the impossibility of any permanent modern order. Hence, the Right-Wing death squads in Latin America were ultimately fulfilling the leftist Rockefeller agenda for 'progressive globalist change'. Meanwhile most of the world's nationalists waged anti-colonial and anti-imperialist partisan liberation wars, which attracted the sympathy of some of the forces of the European New Right.

Rightists will therefore inevitably serve as a tool for the 'progressive' status quo, or eventually become left-wing partisans of some kind. All the forces of the right within the postwar period were assimilated into either faction, and the forces of the contemporary right will likewise undergo a similar process of assimilation. Actual Right-Wing politics is always the solidification of leftism. The Straussians who would become the neoconservatives of the Bush era were Right-Wing. But they were Right-Wing only insofar as they gave some permanent form to the 'free and open West.' To be a 'Right-Winger' meant to defend the 'Western values' of gay rights, feminism, tolerance, political equality, democracy, etc. - something which appears rather awkward from the perspective of the historical Right. But in actual fact, this is all Right-Wing politics really amounts to: Giving solidity, generality and form to the 'progressive' and 'leftist' cultural and political policies of the bourgeoisie. Judeo-Christian civilization must, after

all, be defended against the Asiatic horde!

That is because Right-Wing politics refers to nothing more than the pure and undistilled political power of the bourgeoisie. It is not an *ideology*, it is a *reality*. The reign of modern order consists in the reign of ‘techne’ (as Heidegger pointed out), it is the order of disorder, the order of nihilism, abstraction, negation and spiritual devastation. It is established order, *false order*, *purported order*. All politics is Right-Wing that entails the moment of its preservation, securitization, and prolonging. By contrast, while the partisan is revolutionary, they move in the embrace of the eternal, and move like a fish through the waters of the people. Its politics of order are not contrived from the temporal interests of an already condemned regime, but take their sanction from the starry sky above, boundless and eternal heaven. The partisan is the true *conservative revolutionary*, suspended in the embrace of the *eternal*, the eternal fire of Heraclitus, which cannot be apprehended in any one-sided way, but only as the unity of opposites - and there, true, sacral order (*kosmos*), the order for which the *destruction of reality* is only a moment in the becoming of, can be *perceived* - not justified, not apologized for, not instrumentalized - *but grasped*.

If reality is smashed into pieces, one cannot simply put the pieces back together to make reality whole again. The *smashing* has now proven that *it is itself* part of the whole of reality. And so true political struggle occurs along the lines of the *reconciliation*, not any mere contradiction between ‘change’ and ‘order,’ ‘destruction’ and ‘conservation,’ - but *how* change is resolved into order, and *how* destruction is itself conserved. The end of history has entailed, therefore, the end of the political Left and Right Wing: The former taking its final form in partisanship, and the latter in leftism itself. The ‘Left’ is by nature something *malign*. The existence of a ‘Left’ is a *misfortune*, a relic of the catastrophic modern age that humanity now struggles to recover from. The partisan will thus not only lead to the destruction of leftism, but render ‘Left-Wing’ politics obsolete and superfluous, as the development of civilizations hurdles forth in harmony with true, sacral order into the annals of the future. Politics will no longer have to be defined by change itself, but by *what it is changing into* - positive being, rather than modernity’s empty negation, will become the object of humanity.

For the MAGA movement, the most fatal threat lies in the exact opposite ‘reconciliation’ Agents of deception like Ron DeSantis, alongside the supposed

'rightward shift' of CNN now do what the Lincoln Project Republicans couldn't, and that is prevent the MAGA takeover of the Republican Party. Neoconservatism is making its most vicious, final, and potent return - reconciling the 'leftist' chaos of the past decade into a new 'Western' order defined by genocidal designs upon China and Russia. As Europe approaches its most severe energy crisis, and China continues to overthrow the power of Wall Street and the City of London, the final gasp of 'Right Wing' politics and leftism alike will take the form of something we are already witnessing in Ukraine, and that is a merger of the leftist woke agenda, neoconservative hawkish aspirations toward China & Russia, and the faux veneer of a revived America ('build back better'). A complete takeover of the Hitlerite kind is all but now inevitable, which will attempt to satisfy the patriotic aspirations of the MAGA movement into consensus for war, a war which will seek to preserve the power of the bankers and globalists.

Xi Jinping of China was recently named the 'greatest threat to the open society' by (((George Soros))). And while many believe that China is allied with the globalists, that is only because they had attempted to use it, following China's reform and opening up, to prolong their economic reign. They underestimated and did not take into account that the Communist Party had outsmarted them, and it is now readying itself and scrambling itself for an all-out-confrontation. All the typical fake 'conservative' jingoism and rhetoric will then be propagated by the ruling establishment - between 'Western civilization' and 'the Asiatic Chinese,' between 'freedom loving Americans' and the 'Communist Chinese.' All of this is nothing short of opportunism seeking to dupe and extinguish the partisanship of the MAGA movement, and hijack it into a vehicle for the same globalists it is, in its heart of hearts, attempting to fight against. They realize that attempting to enforce woke values by force hasn't work, so they are going to start pretending to be conservatives to dupe the people into fulfilling the same ends.

For our part, the Communists disdain to conceal their aims. We plainly believe that the MAGA movement requires its own political party. While we remain sympathetic to Republican candidates genuinely aligned against the establishment, the majority of the Republican Party remains firmly entrenched and in the hands of the same globalist ruling class. We hope the great leaders and figures of the MAGA movement will endure the coming re-alignment, and join forces with all genuine partisan forces into forming a real *working class* third party. Trump, for his part, while having been a real political

outsider, is being blackmailed, is embroiled in politically-motivated lawsuits and is being targeted by the FBI. Whatever happens to Trump, the spirit of the MAGA movement must survive, because 2016 was only the beginning. We believe the MAGA movement has the potential to be turbo-charged into a revolutionary movement by, of, and for the American working class. There is no other choice for us American MAGA Communists.

We will face many difficulties and obstacles in the road ahead. People may not immediately agree with us, and that is fine. We will go where the MAGA movement goes, because we sincerely believe in its truest aspirations. It is the duty of American Communists to stand by the people, and become genuine fighters for the people, regardless of how well their ideological message is at first received. We have no other belief than belief in the power of the American working class. We will win over the MAGA movement, or we will become politically extinct. There is nowhere else for us to go. We have no interest in winning the support of insulated and self-content leftist scum, who are the prostitutes of the bourgeoisie. Our faith lies with the people alone, and so MAGA Communists now make it their goal to go down to the people, and fight alongside them in a common, partisan struggle against the ruling class.

A spectre is haunting American politics, and it is the specter of MAGA Communism. No matter how much we are slandered, attacked deplatformed and censored, we aren't going anywhere. MAGA Communism is rising. And soon enough, all other 'communists'